

# Christian Education

---

Vol. XIV

APRIL, 1931

No. 7

---

## EDITORIAL

### THE CONFESSION OF FAITH OF JUSTICE HOLMES

In introducing Associate Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes to the radio audience on his ninetieth birthday anniversary, Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes submitted this extract from his writings with the remark that it may be taken as the confession of faith of the distinguished jurist:

But if he is a man of high ambitions he must leave even his fellow adventurers and go forth into a deeper solitude and greater trials. He must start for the pole. In plain words, he must face the loneliness of original work. No one can cut out new paths in company. He does that alone. He knows now what he had divined at the outset, that one part of the universe yields the same teachings as any other if only it is mastered, that the difference between the great way of taking things and the small, between philosophy and gossip, is only the difference between realizing the part as a part of a whole and looking at it in its isolation as if it really stood apart.

I care not very much for the form if in some way he has learned that he cannot set himself over against the universe as a rival of God, to criticize it, or to shake his fist at the skies, but that his meaning is its meaning, his only worth is as a part of it as a humble instrument of the universal power. It seems to me that this is the key to intellectual salvation, as the key to happiness is to accept a like faith in one's heart, and to be not merely a necessary but a willing instrument in working out the inscrutable end.

\* \* \* \* \*

### RECENT COLLEGE MERGERS

#### *Lombard with Knox*

President Britt has made the following statement concerning the merger of *Lombard with Knox*, both located in Galesburg,

Ill., the immediate occasion of which was the financial difficulties of the former, whose falling income rendered continuance as an independent institution impossible. The terms of the merger, which was academic rather than legal, were very simple.

(1) Lombard students were received by Knox by transfer of credits at the full Lombard valuation, even though in some cases credit was granted for work in subjects not recognized in the Knox curriculum. This was due to a desire to enable them to continue their education without undue dislocation. The resident tuition for 1930-31 was continued to these students at the same figure that they would have paid at Lombard—\$200 instead of \$250—the regular Knox rate.

(2) The academic and alumni records of Lombard were transferred to the office of the Knox Registrar and the Knox Alumni office.

(3) Members of the Lombard faculty became members of the Knox faculty,—but this as the result of personal arrangement rather than a merger process.

Beyond the points indicated, Knox took no responsibility for carrying on or closing out the affairs of Lombard. In no sense was this a corporate or legal merger. The two charters remain distinct and the Board of Trustees of Lombard still exists and is responsible for the gradual liquidation of property and discharge of liabilities.

#### *Queens-Chicora*

President W. H. Frazer of *Queens-Chicora College*, Charlotte, N. C., reports the legal consolidation of Queen's College, owned by three Presbyteries of North Carolina, and Chicora College, Columbia, S. C., owned by the Synod of South Carolina—all of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. It was agreed that

(1) The title of the college should be vested in a board of thirty trustees, one-half to be elected by the Synod of South Carolina and one-half by the Presbyteries of North Carolina, including additional Presbyteries, or by the Synod, provided said bodies share in ownership of the college.

(2) The Synod of South Carolina should liquidate the assets of the board of trustees of Chicora College, pay off all indebted-

ness, dissolve the corporation so denominated, and pay over the surplus to the Trustees of Queens College. The board of trustees of Chicora College and the Synod of South Carolina release other parties and Queens College, Inc., from liability on debts claims, etc., of the Chicora College trustees or other agents.

(3) The combined institution should be located in Charlotte, N. C.

(4) The name "Queens-Chicora" should be adopted for the present, authority to change the name being lodged with the new board of trustees.

(5) All equity in the property of Chicora College should be turned over to the Trustees of Queens-Chicora for erection of a dormitory, increase of endowment, or any approved purpose, except that trust funds shall be administered in accord with trust agreements.

(6) The Synod of South Carolina shall contribute a fair percentage of its educational budget to Queens-Chicora, grant access of accredited representatives of the college to its educational field, endorse the institution and assist in maintaining a student body of the highest type.

(7) The scholarship records of alumni and students of Chicora and Queens are to be preserved and protected.

(8) The new institution assumes all responsibility for raising the present endowment to a sum sufficient to place it on the membership list of the Southern Association, and will not expect the Synod of South Carolina to engage in a campaign for this purpose.

(9) No limitation or discrimination may be imposed on the number of students from the Synod of South Carolina, but enrolment of such students shall be encouraged.

(10) Due provision shall be made for the president and faculty of Chicora College.

(11) The new Queens-Chicora College shall be in fact and in name the official standard college for women of all the owning and controlling bodies.

(12) The united efforts of the contracting parties shall be pledged anew to the continued development and progress of the new institution.

*Hendrix-Henderson and Galloway Woman's*

From the office of President Reynolds of Hendrix (Hendrix-Henderson) College, Conway, Ark., comes a brief statement regarding the merger of *Hendrix-Henderson College* with *Galloway Woman's College* at Searcy, Ark. The consolidation involves the operation as one institution of a standard coeducational senior college at Conway, to be known as Hendrix College, and of a standard junior college for women at Searcy, under the name of Galloway College. The two colleges have the same board of trustees, the same president, registrar and business manager, all the records financial and academic being kept at the senior college. The alumnae of Galloway Woman's College, the alumni of Henderson Brown College (previously combined with Hendrix) and of Hendrix College are made alumnae and alumni of Hendrix College at Conway. The system will be Trinity System of Colleges. For the present the two charters are retained.

This merger is the culmination of a consolidating process that has been going on for several years, affecting three institutions.

R. L. K.

\* \* \* \* \*

A bill has been passed by Congress and signed by the President relating to the inclusion in a man's estate of all trusts, either revocable or irrevocable, which he may have set up during lifetime. By this bill it is enacted that if a man receives the income of a trust during life, that trust which earns the income is to be regarded upon his death as within his estate and is therefore taxable. Hitherto, irrevocable trusts which yielded him an income during life, were not taxable. Hitherto it was deemed that a man parted with an irrevocable gift at the time at which he made it. Now, if he continues to receive an income from it, the law makes it that he parts with it at the time his income ceases, namely, at death.

A. W. A.

## MODERN EDUCATION AND RELIGION

EDWIN MIMS

Professor of English, Vanderbilt University

Does the modern educational process ignore religion, or combat religion, or does it develop religious attitudes and values? I think you will agree with me that this is a very difficult question for anybody to answer, and especially for a college professor who is inclined to look askance at any sweeping generalizations, who teaches in an institution in which there are conflicting theories of education, and who has from experience and observation been aware of the many interpretations of religion held by innumerable sects and races. Surely there is need of definitions before one can begin to think straight about so baffling a problem as is presented in this question.

One may best begin by asking certain counter questions. Does the modern home ignore religion, or combat religion, or develop religious attitudes and values? Or modern business in the full grip of the machine age? Or the modern state? Or the modern church with its emphasis on ecclesiasticism, organization, ritualism? Perhaps in the answer to these questions some of the onus might be taken from the chief sinner, the modern educational process.

Or suppose we put the same question with regard to the former or ancient educational process. Has there ever been a time when there was not a seeming conflict between culture and piety, knowledge and faith? Did you ever hear of the contrasting ideals of Hellenism and Hebraism, of the Renaissance and the Reformation, of the struggles between the Anglicans and the Puritans? Need I remind you that Oxford lifted up the banner of Charles the First when he had fled from London, and at a later time expelled the Methodists for their onslaught on rationalism, or that the Harvard of the Awakening of New England was attacked by the evangelical sects of America, and that no less vehemently the University of Virginia, established by Thomas Jefferson on a broad basis of academic freedom and progress, was assailed as the very citadel of free-

thinkers and atheists? Perhaps when these questions have been answered, some of the onus may be taken from the *modern* educational process.

Just what do we mean by the modern educational process? Is it the increasing emphasis on scientific facts and hypotheses, or on the scientific method that has gradually invaded every realm of human knowledge—what a brilliant essayist has called the idolatry of science, or what others have called the new Messiah who has come to solve all the problems in the world and out of it and to introduce an era of utility and progress? Do we mean the increasing emphasis on vocational, technical, professional training as the determining motive in all our education that will eventually do away with any need of the liberal arts college in a world governed by material standards and mechanistic conceptions? Do we mean the tendency in all our teacher training institutions to substitute “interest” for “discipline” as the controlling principle in the making of curricula from kindergarten to university? Or are we to believe that there can be no education without enormous resources in the form of endowments and equipment, which take on the form of our very industrial system and result in mass production and standardized products?

Put in this way—in this extreme way—the questions would leave little room for doubt in the minds of this audience. All of these tendencies in education would either ignore religion or actually combat it, and there would be little opportunity to develop religious attitudes and values. And when we add to these tendencies the elements in our modern institutions that make for an undue emphasis on social life of the most dissolute type and on athletics of a professional type and on many other forms of extra-curricular activities, the case against the modern educational process seems to be established—not only as to religious values but as to intellectual and aesthetic values. To read the satires on our colleges by brilliant novelists or the more serious articles and books by men speaking from the inside, is apt to produce either a tone of pessimism or a militant determination to put an end to such conditions. I do not wonder that serious-minded men, intent on religious attitudes and values, are

profoundly concerned about a process or processes that seem to make against what we have thought to be the most valuable things in civilization. Surely they have a right to be indignant when so many college officers and teachers try to present a solid front whenever criticism is directed towards their indifference or their positive antagonism to constructive proposals.

Let me hasten to add that, in my opinion, conditions are not as bad as they seem to be, or as the way in which I put my series of questions would seem to indicate. There is nothing quite so futile as the railing against one's own age, and nothing quite so vain as the attempt to escape from the complexities of modern life and thought into some fancied golden age of the past or the future. I refuse to believe that this is the only age in which some portion of the Word of the Lord has not been revealed; that to my mind is the worst form of infidelity, or, if you please, atheism. I do not know how to draw an indictment against the whole educational process or system which is now dominant. Things may be in the saddle, but they will not continue to ride mankind. All our science and all that we mean by the scientific method, all our attempts to bring a more efficient training to an increasing proportion of our people, all of our material achievements, yes, and the new freedom now so largely demanded by college faculties and students, may be new instruments in the hands of those who are primarily concerned with aesthetic and spiritual values.

Let me illustrate. I resent as much as any of you the extremes to which many scientists have gone in their insistence that everything must be judged from the scientific standpoint, that the only valid question about anything is, Is it scientific? that the only knowledge that is worth while is that which comes from observation or experiment or measurement, and that all other questions must be met with a frank and honest agnosticism. From Herbert Spencer to Harry Elmer Barnes there have been far too many investigators and teachers who have maintained an insolent attitude towards spiritual values. When Barnes exclaims that the discovery of certain amazing facts about Betelgeuse and Antares "blows sky-high the foundations of the whole set of moral conceptions of Judaism and Christian-

ity," and when he asks, "Could anything be more satisfying as the ultimate reward of activity than the state of complete extinction to be realized in the chemical state known as death," I wonder that such a man is now teaching at one of our great institutions for the education of women. The emphasis on the littleness and bestiality of man will produce an inevitable reaction. It is no wonder that men recoil from science in the face of such exponents. And when Clarence Darrow is put forth as the champion of the forces of enlightenment to fight the battle for scientific knowledge, one feels almost persuaded to become a Fundamentalist.

But is that the right attitude? Let the extremist speak out so that we may know whom and what we have to fight. It is well for us to realize that the devotion to science has led to a point of view among the very greatest scientists of today that is overthrowing the whole mechanistic and materialistic interpretation of the cosmic universe. I need only allude to the chapter now being written by Einstein, Eddington, Jeans, in the realm of physics, or to the statement signed by fifteen of the most prominent and representative scientists of this country which says in memorable language:

The purpose of science is to develop a knowledge of the facts, the laws, and processes of nature. The even more important function of religion is to develop the consciences, the ideals, and aspirations of mankind. Each of these activities represents a deep and vital function of the soul of man, and both are necessary for the life, the progress, and the happiness of the human race.

We have all been deeply concerned about the progress of Behaviorism during the past decade. When I read the enthusiastic and militant words of John B. Watson, the chief crusader, and witness his pride that the doctrine is making such headway in academic circles, I wonder what we have come to when intelligent men can find the study of rats and other animals the basis of their profoundest observations on man. Their words produce a reaction in the minds of thoughtful men. Let them speak out that we may see how lacking in common sense they are when they try to destroy consciousness and mind. We shall prefer to

turn to the more sensible psychology of James and Angell and McDougall—all of them university men, let us remember. Surely science will not in the long run lose its common sense. A little psychology may turn men's minds to atheism, but much will bring them around to religion. James's *The Will to Believe* is an unanswerable defense of faith, arrived at by personal experience.

I am sure that we have grown impatient with sociologists who have so studied the abnormal specimens of humanity, the delinquents of society, that they have lost sight of the higher social values. Their effect on immature students has been sometimes exceedingly harmful. But we become less alarmed when we read in the books of Charles A. Ellwood on *The Reconstruction of Religion* and *Man's Social Destiny*—books characterized by much research and learning as well as by insight and philosophical sweep—such sentences as the following:

Science not only held that there was nothing in religion of serious scientific concern, but that the spiritual aspects of human life were outside of reality. In some university circles for a scientific man to express his belief in Christian social ideals was for him to be more or less discounted by his colleagues. . . . If religion is a vital element in civilization, then the attainment of a rational, ethical religion is one of the greatest and most fundamental of our social needs. . . . We shall not be able to reconstruct our civilization without the reconstruction of our religion. . . . It is time that organized Christianity become synonymous with the religion of Jesus. It is the only possible social future if the world is not going to turn back to barbarism. . . . Religion is the summation of all our values, the vision of all things in the light of eternity.

That is just as real sociology as the more extreme statements of one-eyed and narrow specialists.

Have we not sometimes felt that philosophy has abdicated its position as queen of the sciences or as the synthesis of all knowledge and become the slave of the sciences? Materialism and mechanism were the natural sequence of much scientific research. The philosophy of Haeckel and Bertrand Russell, the Pragmatism of James as interpreted not by himself but by his

followers and without regard to the import of some of his other writings, the Instrumentalism of John Dewey, went far afield from the great tradition of Plato, Spinoza, and Kant. Just when the situation looked darkest, came Bergson, Eucken, and, more recently, Whitehead. The latter, who is now most in the public mind, has reminded scientists that science deals with abstractions—it abstracts from real objects only those qualities that may be scientifically known; that nature cannot be divorced from its aesthetic values; that all the achievements of science have been built on the instinctive faith in a rational order of Nature; and that a thorough-going evolutionary philosophy is inconsistent with materialism. He has reminded us all that

religion is the vision of something that stands beyond, behind, and within the passing flux of immediate things; something which is real and yet waiting to be realized . . . something that gives meaning to all that passes and yet eludes apprehension, something whose possession is the final good . . . something which is the ultimate ideal, and the hopeless quest. . . . Apart from religion, human life is a flash of occasional enjoyments lighting up a mass of pain and misery, a bagatelle of transient experiences. . . . The worship of God is not a rule of safety—it is an adventure of the spirit, a flight after the unattainable. . . . The world lives by its incarnation of God in itself. Apart from God there would be no actual world. . . . He is the binding element in the world. The consciousness which is individual in us is universal in Him; the love which is partial in us is all-embracing in Him. . . . Every act leaves the world with a deeper or fainter impress of God.

We are forced to say again—A little philosophy inclineth man to atheism or materialism or determinism; but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion. I like to think that the younger generation will find itself turning to the leadership of men like Whitehead, now teaching in our oldest and greatest university and influencing all other institutions who have attended “the invisible Harvard.”

May I take as the last illustration of subjects now taught in colleges that with which I am most familiar, English literature. I feel as impatient as any of you with some of the things that are done in the name of literature. I refer not only to the effort

of many to magnify unduly the scientific and technical treatment of literature, the tendency of scholars to put the emphasis of their research on topics of the most minute and insignificant value, but to the tendency of teachers to ignore, to lose every opportunity to interpret, the deeper meanings of literature, to lose sight of the main thing that caused writers to write. I have known scholars to magnify the language, the sources, the dramatic technique of Shakespeare and miss entirely the sense of a moral order that informs his great tragedies. No one can read Bradley's great work on the tragedies and not feel that one of the most impressive ideas in the whole range of literature is expressed again and again in these tragedies. There could be no greater protest against the naturalism that pervades so much of modern drama and fiction, a point of view that denies moral responsibility of any kind. I have known teachers of Browning to emphasize the dramatic monologue, his paganism, his versatility, and yet omit entirely that large group of poems which treat, not theologically or philosophically but dramatically, the great idea of the Incarnation, the central note of which is, "I say the acknowledgment of God in Christ, accepted by thy reason, solves for thee all the problems in the world and out of it." Some wax eloquent over the blank verse, the classical allusions, the epic qualities of Milton, without once interpreting his religious faith or his vision of the Eternal. Worse still, many teachers of literature have fallen under the dominance of contemporary literature, much of which is saturated with cynicism, naturalism, determinism.

When I have admitted all that, I must add that there are far more scholars than many realize who have kept alive the great tradition. If you think of Mencken, let me remind you of Stuart Sherman, who so long taught in one of the Mid-West universities and who was a constant champion of the spiritual values in literature, ancient and modern, and who in his later years was trying to winnow the wheat from the chaff in contemporary literature. "What the average man now wants," he once wrote, "is the large-scale production and the wide diffusion of science, art, music, literature, health, recreation, manners, happiness—the best to be had; and he is going to get them and to glorify whole-

heartedly the heroes of culture who provide them for him." Men like the late Winchester of Wesleyan, Perry of Harvard, Phelps of Yale, Van Dyke of Princeton, and many others less well known, are examples of what teachers of literature have done to keep alive the more wholesome, the more spiritual, appeal of great literature. Or to cite one more example: the best equipped critic that America has had, the author of the *Shelburne Essays*, who for the past few years has retired to Princeton to produce a series of great studies of Platonism and Christianity. I do not agree with all that Paul Elmer More has written; I think he is too prone to ignore or combat entirely the tendencies of modern life and thought, to live too remote from the world, but when all is said, he has given us all who read him a new basis for faith in the fundamentals of religion and philosophy. His *Christ the Word*—based on a study of the Fourth Gospel—is one of the profoundest expositions of the essential doctrines of the Christian religion ever written. Literature, it can not be too often said, is one of the most valuable allies of those who would conserve the spiritual interpretation of man and the universe.

My conclusion, then, is that some scholars who are identified with the educational process or system, ignore religion, some combat religion, and some develop religious attitudes and values. How many would be included in each of these categories I can not tell, or what the general trend is. I am quite sure that it is not a matter that can be determined by charter, or resolution, or administration. I taught for sixteen years in a church college, whose president stoutly maintained that only in such an institution could there be such a thing as Christian education; that in any state university it was unconstitutional for any professor to teach a subject by giving a religious interpretation of it. It so happened that I taught for three years in the University of that same state, and I taught exactly as I had taught in the church college, and though I never hesitated to express my faith in the Christian religion and to use literature as the basis of that faith, I never received even the mildest suggestion that I was doing anything out of the ordinary. I now teach in an independent, privately endowed university, which won a notable victory over the forces of ecclesiasticism that sought to

control it, and I have taught exactly in the same way and in the same spirit as in the other types of institutions. I do not know how to do otherwise.

In all these institutions there were men who were agnostics, naturalists, cynics, men who were indifferent as to what they or their pupils believed or did not believe; and in all of them there were men of deep religious faith, who in the classroom and out of it, exerted all their influence in the direction of a positive faith. Nor is there anything in the subject that insures the manner of treatment. A mathematician in the church college conducted one of the "snap" courses that almost anybody could pass with a minimum of work; another, in the independent institution, maintained the strictest standards and wielded the largest personal influence over the lives of students of all the men I have known. A professor of history in the church college was as far removed from a religious interpretation of history as a man could well be, for he had been indoctrinated with the economic theory of history and would have mocked at the suggestion of one increasing purpose or of a far off divine event. A professor of history in a university that was supposed to be a citadel of modernism and agnosticism joined the church on profession of faith and became a potent religious influence.

One thing is certain, any talk about Christian education must emphasize education as well as Christian. One explanation of the indifference or the positive antagonism of many teachers to the demand for religious instruction is that so many frauds are perpetrated in its name. If they teach in church colleges after having been trained in the larger universities they are apt to feel the restrictions and limitations. They are repelled by the cant and hypocrisy and intolerance and time-serving of college presidents and officers. They often react to an opposite extreme and in their hearts are dreaming of an early escape. No amount of piety can atone for a lack of honest and accurate work. Loose thinking may be just as fatal as loose living. Preachers and Christian laymen too often insist that it isn't what you know but what you are that determines character, and thus lay the basis for slipshod work in the classroom by those who are leaders in campus activities and especially in all forms of social

service. If others teach in a state university, they are inclined to turn their freedom into license, and to pose as the emancipated and the intelligentsia. Andrew D. White's *Warfare of Science and Theology* is responsible for much of their thinking about religious bigotry and intolerance, and they are ready to join in smiting the Infamous. In other words, college professors are like most human beings in not being able to react from one extreme without going to the other. It would seem as if a modicum of education ought to lead to the golden mean in thinking and living.

One mistake that is made by some in the consideration of the topic now under consideration is that we are too apt to insist in matters of faith on the policy of "All or nothing." A broad tolerance seems to me necessary for many shades of opinion. In the face of a common enemy we ought not to fight so often over a difference of uniform. The common enemy today is materialism, cynicism, pessimism. Let us unite forces with all who in any way are fighting against the foes of the human spirit. We may not be satisfied with the complete statement of faith made by an Einstein or an Eddington or a Millikan; they are certainly not orthodox nor even liberal in their views, but they have much to give in this fight for our very souls. We may not agree with the Humanists, some of whom ignore religion because it seems to limit the faculties of man, and some of whom turn to Catholicism or Anglicanism as the more aesthetic forms of religion, but they are all standing for the inner check as opposed to expressionism, for restraint and moderation as opposed to license, for the free will as opposed to theories of moral irresponsibility. They are on the side of the angels. We may find it difficult to swallow the whole program of vocational training, but we ought to see that people who formerly would not have come into the process of education at all are being trained to finer use of their powers; when things are done right, and especially when they are done in the spirit of the ideal, they have lost their material significance. We may not agree with Walter Lippman in his attack on supernaturalism, but we can profit by his analysis of the *impasse* to which modern intellectualism in all its forms has come, and by his advocacy of the "higher

religion of the sages," even though he has failed to see that the religion which he finds in Jesus and Buddha and Confucius is all posited on their reliance upon the supernatural, which he has discarded as impossible for the modern man.

I do not mean, of course, that those of us who believe in the Christian religion are to be so broad and catholic that we shall be tossed about by every wind of doctrine. I have no use for the Laodicean type of believer. If we magnify the fundamentals of our faith—the real fundamentals as taught by Jesus—we cannot hope too much or fight too valiantly. There are signs that we may be writing a new chapter in the history of religion, and it may be called by a future historian the New Reformation. We can never win the inquiring and restless souls of this generation by appealing to an infallible church, nor to an infallible book literally interpreted and regarded as of equal value in all its parts. Only in the personality and teachings of Jesus is there a solid foundation for faith. There is something about Him that appeals to the adventurous souls of men. It is amazing how simple and yet far-reaching are His interpretations of man and God. He has been buried underneath all sorts of rubbish; His progress has been held back by all sorts of baggage. It is time that we see Him as He was and to hear Him as He spoke in those resounding words about ultimate things. In a very real sense He may rise from the dead once more!

If the religion of Jesus should take hold of the hearts and imaginations of men, then the words of H. G. Wells, in the conclusion of his *Outline of the World's History* may become prophetic:

Out of the trouble and tragedy of the present time, there may emerge a moral and intellectual revival, a religious revival, of a simplicity and scope to draw together men of alien races and now discrete traditions into one common and sustained way of living for the world's service. . . . The beginnings of such things are never conspicuous. Great movements of the racial soul come at first like a thief in the night and then suddenly are discovered to be world-wide. Religious emotion—stripped of corruption and freed from its last priestly entanglements—may presently blow through life again like a great wind, bursting the doors and flinging open the shutters of the individual life, and making many

things possible and easy that in these present days of exhaustion seem almost too difficult to desire. . . . There is a social consciousness at work in our minds and hearts that will yet deliver us from the wicked man. In spite of much occasion for pessimism to-day, there is occasion for greater optimism than man ever before had.

---

## THE INFLUENCE OF THE COLLEGE ON HOME BUILDING

LUCY JENKINS FRANKLIN

Dean of Women, Boston University

Two years ago a conference similar to this one was summarized as having resulted in one unmistakable fact—that of general confusion. If this conference ends in a similar fashion I think we are to be encouraged. Confusion is helpful, because it is hopeful. It is an evidence of staggering problems and staggering problems recognized as such, means progress. The best result of general confusion is its stimulation to further study and experimentation. The college or university that is not experimenting today is decadent and it is equally true, I believe, that the home that is not studying and experimenting is also decadent and the young people in that home, if they are of college age and are real thinkers, feel the stagnation keenly and are trying to escape from its influence.

My remarks will, of necessity, be based upon my experience with college students; with my class for the training of deans of women in Boston University, which is made up of advisors, or those soon to be advisors, in high schools, normal schools and colleges, and from voluntary private interviews. I stress the word "voluntary" for a dean of women gets very little helpful data from a conference of her own seeking.

In this age of general confusion and maladjustment of both adults and youth, it seems to me the time has come to adopt a few definite objectives, common to both the college and the home and to work toward them assiduously even though we may discard them for something better within the next decade.

APRIL, 1931



CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

The secondary schools have carried on some very fine pieces of study and experimentation for the past fifteen years. The colleges have been conservative and have assumed a more or less superior attitude toward it. The universities have sponsored the experiments but the secondary school system has been their laboratory. The home has been left out of the picture with the result that domestic rupture, rather than adjustment, has too frequently followed. The secondary schools have come to some decisions. They have adopted for the present at least four objectives—health; constructive leisure time activity; social relations; and vocations. These objectives are in noticeable conformity with the results of the study made by the North Central Association. They are also being used as bases for research for the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees. If the college and the home are to work together for mutual good, it seems to me they would not go far afield if they should adopt these same general objectives.

I would make but one or two changes in them to meet the college situation. We all agree with the secondary schools, I am sure, that *health* should be our first common objective. By health I mean not only physical but mental, social and emotional health. Many homes do not understand the first principles of mental health today and the great possibilities of family adjustment and happiness that can be obtained through it. If high schools, colleges, universities and churches should follow President Hoover's example and sponsor frequent health conferences throughout America, for the benefit of students and parents, we would see some very desirable results in a short time. But such conferences are now held for the specialists—doctors, social workers, deans and psychiatrists—while the parents who are the real laboratory workers and the ones most concerned with the results of the experiments, know the least about them. Health education for parents and students is one of the great needs in America today.

The second objective of the secondary schools and one to which I believe we are constrained to agree is *constructive leisure time*. In the recent book *Higher Education Faces the Future*, almost every article mentions leisure time as one of our great problems. It has been created by the machine and will be with us until we become masters of the leisure time the machine has brought to us.

It is always profitable to study the ages when we are trying to solve the problems of the age. In ancient Greece, after the Persian wars, they were compelled to adjust themselves rather suddenly to a great number of slaves. Every Grecian boy had five of these slaves to manage. They were men. Today your boy and mine have thirty-five slaves to manage. They are machines. What they did in ancient Greece to meet the situation is both interesting and instructive and I shall speak of it later. Suffice it to say that constructive leisure time, in the home, in the school, in business, in industry, in our whole social structure should be a national objective.

The third goal of the secondary schools, *vocations*—what our children are to do in life—should be another common objective for both the home and the college. Our young people are confused as they stand before the vast sea of knowledge that has increased during the last fifty years far beyond our power to comprehend. In the fifth century Martianus Capella wrote a play embodying all the knowledge then recognized as such. In the seventh century the knowledge of the world could be compressed into twenty brief books. Many years later an Oxford don who had nothing more interesting to do, further compressed these twenty books into encyclopaedic information that was printed in two columns of modern type. Less than three hundred years ago the uncle of Sir Francis Bacon wrote him a letter in which he asked him what his specialty in life would be and the answer was, "My specialty will be the whole realm of human knowledge." And such a thing was quite possible in Bacon's time. But think of the modern youth who must face a vast and staggering complexity of human knowledge and must choose and prepare for his life work and then find his place in its intricate mechanism. The home, the public school and the college must help him in this task.

To these three objectives I would add one more which can not be included in the public school list—*religion*. When I told a junior in Boston University a few weeks ago that religion should be an objective in education she said, "Oh, don't call it that. Religion connotes so much that does not meet the situation. Call it a philosophy of life!" But I am old fashioned enough to call

it religion, not however, the religion that you and I were brought up on. The religion of our children will join hands with science. It will be a pragmatic religion that will function under modern social, industrial, racial and world conditions. My plea today is that colleges should step down from their pedestals and cooperate with the secondary schools and the homes in personal problem solving and we will find that all problems of our students come under the four heads—health, leisure time, vocations and religion.

Now let us go back to the first objective—

#### HEALTH

I shall not consider physical health separately today for lack of time. I believe Barnard College has made the most recent contribution to health by deciding that all young women should not be required to take gymnasium work. Those young women whose nerves and emotions are found to be in a strained condition are given gymnasium credit for retiring to a secluded portion of one of the college buildings for a period of complete rest and relaxation.

Not long ago a questionnaire came to my desk asking how many courses were offered in Boston University that bore upon the subject of home making. The mother of one of our students was in my office at the time and I handed her the catalogue and asked her to pick them out. She chose five courses that dealt with home economics, dietetics and chemistry of foods. Later on, another mother who was taking extension courses in the University, found twenty-three such courses which included the housekeeping subjects the first mother had chosen, and also such subjects as sociology, history of the family, biology, hygiene, psychology, ethics, etc. I believe the college can have a great influence over the future home through its class room. I believe that every professor who teaches any course that bears upon human relations should be asked, urged and required to teach that subject with the idea always before him and his pupils that the home is the place where ideal human relationships should culminate. The urban institutions have a greater opportunity to do this since a larger portion of their students are in and out of their homes daily and parents can easily visit the institution.

Two years ago I invited a section of the American Association of University Women, most of them mothers, to visit my class for the training of deans during the two months that we discussed the problems of adolescent health. I also invited two seniors to the class for the same period. The results were most satisfactory. It proved to be the most enlightening period of the year's work and since then I have planned to have a few such mothers for all our discussion periods.

The course in human relations in Yale University will have a great influence on home life if they are wise in planning the details of it. Vassar College is making a marked contribution to the mental health of the family in its summer course in euthenics. At first the mothers and children attended these courses, but now the fathers are invited and one mother in Boston frankly admitted that her family had attended because she felt a mental maladjustment coming on. The course called "The Coordination of Women's Interests" at Smith College is an interesting experiment being financed by the Rockefeller Foundation. Connected with Boston University there is a department of home making, a two years' course which can be augmented by two more years in the School of Education for which a degree of B.S. in Education is received. In connection with this course a Home Information Center is maintained on Beacon Street free for all who care to use it and is financed by Mrs. James J. Storror who has been so generous with her time and money in working for the betterment of the American home. Radcliffe College is now requiring personal interviews with all its prospective students. These conferences are carried on either by the dean herself or by designated alumnae members. After the student is in college the dean writes to the father asking him for a confidential letter concerning his daughter: her personality, tastes, aptitudes, mental attitudes, etc. This letter establishes a friendly relation with the home and is the basis of further correspondence. The dean reports that the data from the home are most valuable in helping the student while in college. As I said in the beginning the college that is not experimenting today is decadent.

I believe it is time for the college to make a survey of its dormitory system. The large dormitory was instituted at the time

the large family flourished. It did not require much mental readjustment for a student to change from a family of six or eight to a dormitory of sixty or eighty, but the average student today comes from a home of one or two children where the individual child is the center of the household with all eyes and hearts turned upon him. Psychiatrists tell us that the normal individual requires three mental satisfactions and should have them to a moderate degree. These are recognition, response, and a feeling of security. One or two children in the modern family will have these requisites to the  $n^{\text{th}}$  degree but when they enter a strange locality and are thrown with a large number of people for twenty-four hours a day they are apt to be deprived suddenly of these three requisites. Therefore, the change often becomes too great for adjustment and a way is opened for mental confusion. Dr. Lydiard H. Horton, a noted psychological research worker of Boston, after a minute study of the disappearance of the Smith College student, attributed that tragedy to this type of mental confusion. She failed to find recognition and response in her enlarged social environment and was seeking the security of the family summer home where she met her death.

I believe the small home-like dormitory in charge of a well chosen housemother, and also the well supervised sorority house, are more in harmony with home conditions today than the large dormitory. Many colleges, of course, would be unable to change their systems but they might find it practical to follow the Harvard plan of organizing small social centers within the large dormitories.

The cooperative system of housing has been tried in Boston University for three years with success if we are to judge from the happiness of the girls and the satisfaction of the parents. With increasing tuition it is increasingly hard to meet college expenses. After a survey of the rural portions of New England it was found that many high honor graduates of the high schools were not able to accept the scholarships offered by the American Association of University Women because they covered such a small fraction of the college expenses. It was for this type of girl that the cooperative housing system was introduced in Boston University. To start it a house large enough to accom-

modate eighteen or twenty girls was rented. It cost \$2,000 to furnish it. In this system the students do all their own work, assume all social and financial responsibility for the home, do their own cooking, pay the salary of their own housemother and share expenses. They have the usual social life: weekly guest nights, Sunday teas, formal dances, etc., and their books are audited by the University auditor. These students maintain their home on \$8.25 per person per week. Massachusetts Institute of Technology has instituted this system for some of its men students and one fraternity in Boston University will adopt it next semester.

The choice of housemothers is a vital factor in the maintenance of mental health in colleges today. A speaker before the National Association of Deans once started his speech by the semi-quotation "House mothers—may their tribe . . . improve!" May I ask the question—Whose fault is it that their tribe does not improve? If they were chosen for their homebuilding as well as their housekeeping ability, if they were required to attend at least one of the college courses in practical psychology or hygiene, if the college would give them a place on the staff of the dean of women and a social status in the college family, they would have the necessary requisites of recognition, response and a feeling of security and their tribe would improve and so would the mental health of the students in their charge.

There is another type of student in our midst that is apt to suffer socially. This is the boy or girl who works in a family for his room and board. We are trying in Boston University to lift housework to a higher social level in the college and in the community. We are now encouraging our self-help girls to live in quiet, well regulated homes instead of doing work in offices and stores where the mental and emotional strain is heavy. We try to select the best homes for these students. The householder must agree to certain requirements if we place a girl with her. The student has a room to herself for study; she has leisure time for social functions and church attendance. Her services to the family are computed at the rate of 35 cents per hour. She is a member of the household and not a servant. She makes a definite contribution to the home and is recognized for it. Such

a student is now known as a "household assistant." We hope this plan, on the new basis, will contribute toward the objective of mental health and happiness, both for the student and for the home.

#### LEISURE TIME

The idea of constructive leisure time as an objective can hardly be separated from education if we look at history. I have already referred to the way in which ancient Greece met their slave problem. In Plato's time, a liberal education was that type which was given a liberated or free man—hence the word *liberal*. The lad who had five slaves was given a training that would enable him to manage his slaves and also the leisure time his slaves created for him. This double objective in education might meet the situation today. It is presumptuous in the face of the vast increase of world knowledge for colleges of liberal arts to attempt to adhere to the 16th century definition of a broad, liberal education which is supposed to enable a student to have an "at home" feeling in any walk of life he might enter. It was possible for Sir Francis Bacon to do it but our students who are receiving A.B. degrees today know full well that they have anything but an "at home" feeling when they graduate. It may be necessary for us to discard the 16th century definition of a liberal education and return to that of ancient Greece, modifying it to meet our needs. It may be wise for our children to learn to manage their thirty-five slaves, machines, and also the leisure time their slaves create for them.

Our students today look upon literature, drama, poetry, art, etc., as belonging to their curricular or work program. Their leisure reading, according to a survey of one college, is made up of *The American Magazine*, *College Humor*, *Cosmopolitan*, and *The Saturday Evening Post*. If it is true that we show our real culture during our leisure time and if this survey is indicative of conditions in all colleges, it behooves both home and college to study the problem. A mother not long ago remarked that she and her daughter were most uncongenial. As she phrased it, they were not "speaking the same language." She was advised to write to her daughter's college for the required reading lists

in some of her courses. She found them interesting and stimulating and when the daughter came home on her vacation she was pleased to find these books on her mother's table. A few months later the mother wrote, "My daughter and I are enjoying each other's company now. I have even donned my 'shock absorbers' and I am reading some of the books she has asked me to read."

The English department in one of the colleges of Boston University is now issuing a small booklet of required leisure time reading. The list covers many fields; the choice is left to the students and they are asked to recommend this list to their parents to whom the booklet is available if they write to the institution for it.

The alumnae magazines in the Eastern women colleges are doing some very interesting work in correlating the reading programs of the college and the home. In these schools it is not a difficult thing to do since so many mothers are also on the alumnae list.

In one secondary school in New England, the father of every boy who attends the school is considered an alumnus during the four years his boy is in attendance and he receives all the alumni literature during that time. I believe it is a field in which the alumni magazine might function.

"Play" is a factor that can not be omitted from our consideration of leisure time. Athletics in colleges have long passed the play stage. They belong today to the category of competitive business. The secondary schools again have preceded us in the study of play. One school in the East requires each boy to choose a "partner sport," which means an outdoor sport at which two can play. In four years he is expected to have a major partner sport so when he enters college he will feel proficient enough in one sport to be anxious to hunt up a partner to play with him. If we can develop a program of play for all, athletics for a few, in our colleges, it will become as necessary in the future to choose a life sport as it is to choose a life work.

#### VOCATIONS

Just now, it seems, the educated family is having a difficult time to keep its children following in the family footsteps. The

children of the uneducated clamor for the classics while those of the educated turn them aside in many instances. A very usual type of conference with mothers runs something like this: "I am a college graduate and so is my husband. We wanted our son to be a lawyer like his father but he has sorely disappointed us. He cares nothing for college." Such parents suffer a great deal but they do not realize that we have aptitude tests today that are becoming more and more dependable. They reveal types of intelligence which should be rated horizontally, not vertically. Their son may have an aptitude for something else in which he will be a success and why should he be a poor lawyer when he can be a good something else?

We decry the Machine Age for its materialism, etc., but it has made a great contribution to civilization. It has elevated the job; menial work is done by machinery and the job now enjoys a cultural level. It is open for a study of its social, moral and spiritual values. No one has ever worked out how much of the practical there is in the cultural or how much culture there is in the practical. In the past the two have been widely separate but the Machine Age, before our very eyes, is fusing and welding the two together. Education in the past has looked down upon the vocational. History has systematically omitted the vocational side of great men's lives. We read Aristotle but we know very little about him as a practicing physician. We read still the philosophies and rhetorics of Boethius but we do not know he was the leading clock manufacturer of his day. We respect Alfred the Great as a scholar and a translator but we do not know he was the greatest ship-builder of his time. Chaucer, the poet, the scholar, whose works form the foundation of the English language, was a road builder. While engaged in this work at one time he became rather peeved at being interrupted so frequently by tourists inquiring their way to Canterbury so he decided to write them up. We read and study the *Canterbury Tales* today but we do not know the vocational circumstances surrounding them. No, writers have not hung the draperies of romance about the shoulders of the job. Life values of the job have not been the subjects of poetry but the Machine Age is revealing these values for the first time in history.

Vocational guides are attending our conferences on the problems of youth today and are making great contributions to them. They are citing instance after instance of the spiritual value of fitting a boy or a girl to his proper work.

Three years ago a boy was brought to the Judge Baker Foundation in Boston because he could not be kept at home. He had run away three times and they could find no reason for it and he could give none. He was not a bad boy. His father was a foreman in a factory with a good salary. The parents had decided that the boy should be a foreman in a factory, with a good salary. Dr. Healy, director of the Foundation, worked on the problem. One day while the boy was being questioned he picked up a piece of paper and drew a picture. When the lad left Dr. Healy looked at the paper and found that it was a very fine likeness of the janitor who had been in the room. This gave him the solution to his problem. The boy's parents knew nothing of art and the boy had no method of expressing his talent at home. A way was found for this boy to return to high school and attend the Normal Art School at night. He has not run away since. He is happy and knows his vocation in life.

But this boy had a special gift. The problem is to help the boy who has no special gift and does not know what he wants to do. Over 50 per cent of the Harvard seniors last year did not know what they were going to do for a life work. Over 60 per cent of the graduates of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology do not follow the work they prepare for. Certainly the home and the school can study vocations to great advantage.

I shall not more than mention again the last objective—*religion*, since another speaker will deal with it, but from my confidential interviews with students I feel constrained to say one thing: that religion must find a new moral code. When it is found it will be very much like the old one—but our young people must find it, the quest is necessary. You and I were taught to obey; our children are taught to choose, therefore, they must know and understand for themselves in order to choose. Young people are thinking about religion and this is causing turmoil in many homes.

A mother in Massachusetts told her daughter not long ago that she had no religion and her daughter quickly responded, "And the little you have is not based upon truth." She could scarcely have come to that conclusion without having spent some thought on it. Another mother asked her son if he believed in God. "Surely," answered the boy, "God to me is the Master Scientist." His mother refused to speak to him for two days. In speaking of it afterwards he said, "My mother can't argue about religion. She doesn't know why she believes anything and I can't believe anything unless I *do* know why. I have a reason for thinking of God as the Master Scientist" and he proceeded to explain. He ended by the quotation "In the beginning was the Word"—*Logos*, and *Logos* means 'Ology'—all the ologies of the universe and that can be nothing but science. Science was with God and Science was God." That young man is thinking and his mother ought to be thinking with him.

We must not forget in dealing with young people today that this is the day of individualism. A very important fact that is evident in personal interviews is that each young person will have his own interpretation of God and will have deep respect for his neighbor's interpretation. This will be an improvement over his parents' religion. It will take time for young people to work out a heart and soul satisfying religion. Just now their minds must be satisfied and we get nowhere in advising them unless we sweep the boards clean and meet them on a rational basis. Give them a little time and the younger generation will work out a soul satisfying religion adequate for their lives, but you and I are no more capable of doing this for them than the war-time statesmen are capable of ushering in world peace.

But we can help them. We can be pioneers in the original sense of the word—"those who clear away the underbrush"—and the underbrush is made up of personal problems of mental, social and emotional life; of leisure time and vocations. This was Christ's method and we can not improve upon it. Worshipful, sacred and devoted problem solving *is* religion and this lamp will light the way to *their* religion.

If we can help them clear the underbrush, our young people will work out a conception of God that will sustain them in daily

life and adjust them to their universe, which is much larger than ours. Their God will be large enough to include the green pastures and the city parks, the flower in the crannied wall and the gleaming lights of the subway, the groves—God's first temples, and the sky-scrappers—His last. The home, the school and the church must help them.

---

### THE STUDENT WORKERS' ROUND TABLE

EDITED BY HARRY T. STOCK

PROPHETS AND REFORMERS

(SUGGESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION GROUPS)

Paul and Silas were accused of "turning the world upside down" (Acts 17: 6).

Jesus was charged with being a revolutionary leader (Luke 23).

Radicals today charge the church with being on the side of the *status quo*.

Conservatives, in the field of economics and sociology, insist that the church is a "busy-body," that it should "stick to its last," that it should "preach the gospel" and let social issues alone.

American Protestantism is accused of being Puritanical—and this word is out of fashion in popular thought. The Puritan is a reformer, and reformers are not approved.

Read some of the Old Testament prophets. Were they "common scolds"? (For example, study several chapters of the book of Amos.) Is the modern preacher called upon to follow in their train?

Consider some quotations from modern writers:

"Christianity is suffering from too much diagnosis. Many of its prophets are becoming common scolds." (Shailer Mathews, *Forum*, February, 1931.) Can a prophet be sweet-spirited? Can we reform without scolding? Must a prophet always seem intolerant?

Rousseau "is the founder of sentimental humanitarianism, that mawkish travesty of Christianity which transfers guilt from the individual to the state under which he lives. Man is always innocent, the government always guilty." (W. R. Inge, *Christian*

*Ethics and Modern Problems*, p. 250.) There are always those who are "agin the government." There are some liberal or radical magazines that are like that—are they safe guides? There are Congressmen who are always against the Administration and seldom in favor of anything that is proposed by the Executive branch, no matter who the President may be. Is that a dangerous state of mind, both for the individual and for the public, or do we need people like this who are "always sticking pins into us"? If one develops a critical attitude toward the government, is he not in danger of seeing all of its ills and few of its good points? How can this be avoided? But is there greater danger still that the church will be "at ease in Zion"?

Preoccupation with social evils is not good for men in general. When the accepted method of reform is to attack the system which produces them there comes into being a habit of mind which lowers the social vitality and causes a loss of social nerve at the very points where the need for both is greatest; while the temper of society, always the chief factor of its health, becomes sour, embittered, despondent, and quarrelsome. . . . The vast growth of the literature of discouragement and the general demand for the exposure of social culpability, might suggest the conclusion that a conspiracy exists to deprive society of its self-respect.

"There was a time when theology waxed eloquent over the total depravity of human nature. As much harm is being done today by the doctrine of the total depravity of the social system." (L. P. Jacks, *Hibbert Journal*.) But must not a Christian cry out against the injustices of modern life? How can he keep from becoming embittered?

Does the average Christian know enough about economic matters to be a prophet of reform? Should he not leave this to the experts? Or is it his business to become informed, and then to speak out?

"Our institutions are never in so much danger from those who are openly trying to destroy them as from the misguided actions of those who think they are saving society." (Calvin Coolidge.) Is this cynicism, or is this the wise conclusion of the student of history and the observer of contemporary life? It is to be noted that Mr. Coolidge is interested in conserving institutions that he thinks have proved their worth. Many reformers think that

many of these institutions may well be sacrificed for the sake of higher values. Which is right? Or are both right?

In an article in *Forum* for February, Geoffrey Laymen speaks of "the complete inability of the average American to understand anyone else's point of view than his own, or indeed to believe that it is possible that there should be any other point of view than his own. . . . Hence a profound conviction of his own moral, mental, and every other kind of superiority to the rest of the world." Are Christian reformers "fanatics"? Are they any more so than the people who oppose them? What is meant by "fanatic"? Must a Christian prophet have something of fanaticism in him?

When a Christian leader advocates a reform, has he any right to do it in the "name of the church" or in the "name of Christianity"? What do you think of Dean Inge's statement, "Nor have groups of clergymen any right to invoke the authority of Christ, or of the Church, to decide questions on which good men notoriously differ." (W. R. Inge, *The Social Teaching of the Church*, p. 103.) Has the church "a message" on international relations, war, relations between the sexes, problems of capital and labor?

Someone has said that in the future the church will have a social creed to which members will give assent when they join the church. Do you agree that that would be a wise policy? Would the creed soon become a means of maintaining the *status quo*? Would a social creed, to which members must agree, be better or worse than a theological creed?

The problem of how to be a prophet and still employ the friendly teaching method is a serious one. It has to do with our whole duty as Christians. What is the method by which Christians, and groups of Christian churches, are going to succeed in the "unfinished tasks of Christianity"?

**DEPARTMENT OF BIBLICAL INSTRUCTION**

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BIBLICAL  
INSTRUCTORS, EDITED BY ISMAR J. PERITZ, PROFESSOR OF  
BIBLICAL LITERATURE, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

*Editorial***THE HELPFUL HANDBOOK**

The appearance of the *Handbook of Christian Education for 1931* is a notable event in educational circles. It has grown to almost twice the size of the previous issue of 1928, and its value has increased proportionately. It presents to the educator and the increasing number of those interested in the movements of education a comprehensive survey of a highly influential institution, the Council of Church Boards of Education, its constitution, publications, and constituent membership. The description of its spheres of influence by Dr. Robert L. Kelly, the executive secretary, is succinct and enlightening; and the story of its history, methods, and objectives by Bishop Thomas Nicholson is exceedingly interesting. It contains much needed lists of denominational foundations and student clubs; of schools of religion; of religious workers with students; and of teachers of the Bible, religion, and religious education. The standards for educational institutions, based on standardizing agencies of the highest rank, furnish a stimulating touchstone for educational values and efficiency. The statistics are a revelation of the number of educational institutions under Christian auspices, of their faculties, student enrolment, and finances. We find also a list of educational foundations, with a description of the objects of their funds, and a full list of educational associations.

The *Handbook* is thus a combination of Who's Who and What is What in Christian education, not only replete with often sought for information, but is calculated to exert a healthful influence on many of the objects of education by creating a sense of solidarity among educational workers and giving inspiration to higher and more effective ideals.

Dr. Kelly and his co-laborers\* deserve the hearty thanks of

\* Specially should the invaluable services of Miss Ruth E. Anderson, the practical maker of the *Handbook*, be acknowledged—R. L. K.

all interested in education for having furnished them with so useful and indispensable aid. The members of the National Association of Biblical Instructors have particular reasons for satisfaction in the publication in that it contains the first published list of its membership.

ISMAR J. PERITZ.

---

### CONTEMPORANEITY IN THE TEACHING OF THE BIBLE\*

THE JEWISH STUDENTS' CRITICISM OF BIBLE TEACHING

RABBI BARUCH BRAUNSTEIN

Counselor to Jewish Students, Columbia University

I suppose you want me to deal, rather practically, with religious problems of Jewish students which are pertinent to your problems in the teaching of the Bible. I shall try to be faithful to my task.

It ought to be made very clear at the outset that much of the lack of interest in matters of religion—for it is not antagonism but indifference to religion—characteristic of the average college student arises out of the presentation of the “religious courses” which, in many colleges, are solely courses in the department dealing with the Bible. I am keenly aware of the great crushing forces on the outside which have made much, going by the name religion, quite anachronistic in our day. But from my experience, a great deal of the lack of interest in religious matters among students arises from courses in the Bible—and especially from the way they are presented and taught.

Now, I am not of those who would want the Bible taught as literature alone. That has its place, to be sure, in any curriculum. I want the Bible taught as Religion—as the text-book, the basic source, document and inspiration for the religions of the Western world.

I want to treat this morning of one of the chief criticisms which students—coming to Columbia from many cities and

\* A paper read before the Twenty-first Annual Meeting of the National Association of Biblical Instructors, New York, December 31, 1930.

colleges throughout America—hold much of the Bible teaching to be guilty of.

To the alert Jewish student the chief criticism is this: the Bible course that he took lacks contemporaneity for him as a Jew. In spite of the fact that the Bible is a deathless and everlasting Book, deathless and everlasting because it deals with the elements of life—with human relationships and with that supreme relationship of man with God—the Jewish student abjures the courses in the Bible when he can do so with impunity, because they are old, musty, antiquarian. They lack relevance to his life as a modern Jew.

The Bible is, after all, the foundation upon which the entire superstructure of Judaism has been reared. Imagine the consternation of the Jewish student who takes a course in the Old Testament and discovers that it is used merely as an introduction to the climax which is in the New Testament. After all, the Old Testament, while it is together with the New Testament the basis for the Christian faith, ought never to be regarded as the heritage solely of the Christian faith. A student once put this whole matter to me: "Here I am a Jew, living more or less by a faith which found its first great expression in the Old Testament, and I am suddenly treated as though I no longer existed! That was too much for me," he said. "I didn't want to appear, living in death, as an anachronism in the class, and so I dropped the course."

Christian scholars often fail to reckon with the contemporaneity of the Jewish faith and people. Sixteen million Jews roughly speaking, subjected to all manner of difficulty and trial and sorrow, have succeeded to survive and live in all corners of the globe—this fact must be reckoned with in any Bible course. They have died for, rather than yield their faith—a faith grounded in the Old Testament, and it is not meet to treat them as living dead—as living witnesses alone of the historicity of one of their brothers who became the idealized founder of a new dispensation. I fear there is an inveterate bias on the part of Christian scholars and teachers of the Bible—though I believe their number is happily growing smaller—to regard Judaism as having done its task and lived its life; that Christianity has

superseded Judaism; that after the birth of Jesus, Judaism died a speedy and immediate death. Such is not the case, however, and many of the ills which have scourged the Jew from the outside have come from this vicious, unhistorical presentation in the Old Testament courses which have trained students to regard the Jew as an anachronism in the modern world. Any academic work rises or falls, in my judgment, upon its validity in preparing men to face life honestly and to see it as a whole.

Take, for example, the abominable fiction of the Jewish-Crucifixion-of-Jesus myth. It would be needless for me to point out to you scholarly gentlemen its historical untruth. But, even if we suppose this myth had some basis in fact, ought the modern Jew to suffer for an act of his forbears committed centuries ago? I shall not repeat the horrors and suffering and shame and harm that fiction has caused the Jewish people in the last sixteen hundred years. That the modern Jew should be held responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus lacks all relevancy to modern life, let alone to the findings of modern Biblical and historical scholarship.

The charge, then, emanating from Jewish students against much Bible teaching today is that it lacks contemporaneity. I said a moment ago that the Bible is the foundation of the Jewish faith, and just as the Jewish people have lived so have they continued and enlarged upon the spirit of the Bible.

How rich a course in the Old Testament is when the evolution, the progression of thought and ideas in that Book is traced for the student! In modern life we woefully need a renewed emphasis upon just this fact—that the Bible represents a growing, never static, experience of man touching and reaching ever higher and higher toward God. Our current literature on the Bible by popular writers—not Biblical scholars, to be sure—evinces the lack of even a primary acquaintance with the Bible. There is one God in the Old Testament—the Ish Milhamah (the War God), the Yahweh of the early tribal Hebrews—these modern writers say. This was brazenly presented in an article which appeared in a recent magazine of some importance. But in truth, the God idea grew in Israel and that growth is reflected in the Old Testament. Step by step the experience of the people

led them away from the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob—painful and difficult as each step forward was—to the universal God of Micah, Isaiah, Malachi and Jeremiah.

But how much richer and more inspiring a course in the Bible would be if, in some way, the enlarging experiences of the living People of the Book could be traced and made contemporaneous with our lives today! The great, inspiring teacher of the Old Testament of tomorrow, just as of yesterday, will be he who has a sense of the continuing life and literature of the Jewish faith, essentially Biblical in character, as the tentacles of the Bible spirit projecting themselves into our modern life.

The deep mystic intuitions found in the Bible did not die after the Bible was canonized. Through the apocryphal and apocalyptic literature, the deep mystic faith in the Midrashic and Rabbinic Literature, the Zohar, the Bahir, the Kabbalah, the speculations of Safed community, to the great outreaching of the mystic spirit in the movement of Hasidism of our day—that is a straight line of development.

Nor is the philosophic mood or temper crystallized for all times in the Bible. That developed too—through the great Rabbins and Sages of the Talmud, through Saadiah Gaon, through Ibn Gabirol, through the great Moses Maimonides, and Mendelssohn and Krochmal, and even to Ahad Ha-Am of our own day—that philosophic temper is a continuous development.

And the legalism of the Bible—that developed, too. It developed as an almost desperate attempt, but as indispensable bond, to keep a scattered people together and to do something, which up to the time of the final dispersion in the year seventy of the common era was unparalleled—that a people should remain a people without a national home and shrine. Jewish law is a straight development from the Bible, the Mishnah, the Talmud, the Geonic Responsa, the Responsa of Jewish scholars in Medieval Europe, through the great codifiers—al-Fasi, Asheri, Karo and Isserles. The latter two together codified the existing Jewish law which, with additions, constitutes Jewish law today. That is a straight development from the Bible up to our own day. And the idea of law has not been rightly understood by the Western world. I believe that it has been

one of the great cementing factors in Jewish life. It has kept Jewish life cohesive, and this idea must be maintained if that life is to continue. How much richer, therefore, would any course in the Old Testament be if the tentacles of the Biblical spirit could be seen projecting themselves through every phase of a living people's life in our own day.

For many Jewish students, as well as for others, a sense of the significance of the land in which the Bible scene was laid is essential. This presupposes some knowledge of Palestine—contemporary Palestine.

In modern Jewish life Palestine has assumed an important rôle, for Zionism is one of the great movements in Jewish life today—attempting to rebuild the country, and to live there according to the teachings of the prophets and to revive the old classical language in which the Old Testament has been preserved. It is almost needless to tell this distinguished audience that Zionism was born in exile—in the Babylonian exile. The return to Zion under Cyrus was the first Aliyah—the first ascent to Zion. I have often played with this thought: what would have happened if Jews had not returned to Palestine twenty-five hundred years ago? And only a handful of them did. Perhaps mankind would have been poorer by two great books. Many of us, poetically captivated and enraptured by the idea of a new Zion, believe that perhaps after a small group of Jews return to Zion a second time—after nineteen centuries and not after a mere fifty years—they will refine and crystallize their experience of suffering and wandering and ostracism into another great human epic—one of a people's undying faith and hope in God. Perhaps a third Testament will issue from that tiny country that has already given two. This is a thrilling revitalizing experience going on in Jewish life today which is expressive of the spirit of the Bible projecting itself into modern life!

From the stirrings of life about us, it seems that there is being reborn an interest in religion. That is being reflected in the increased number of courses in religion that are being taught. Columbia University, where the situation is almost ideal, is offering one hundred and fifty courses in religion this

year, forty of which are being given by the faculty of the Union Theological Seminary. This is a happy augury of a renewed interest in matters of the spirit. The Bible will ever remain the fountain head of the religious spirit. And to be effective, you who present it, will need the sense of its relevancy to life—this contemporaneity of the Biblical spirit in our modern life.

---

### WHAT, THEN, IS THE THEOLOGY OF CRISIS?

JULIUS S. BIXLER

Professor of Religion and Biblical Literature, Smith College

The "theology of crisis" is first of all a protest. It represents a revolt against all complacency—intellectual, moral or religious. It questions present-day ideas of progress and denies that evolution is necessarily change for the better. It cries out against the notion of the goodness and reasonableness of man and the immanence of God in man and in nature, also against the easy conception of a God who loves. It denies the competence of man's intellect to probe to the deepest levels of experience. It is profoundly pessimistic in temper and, so far as the intellect is concerned, profoundly skeptical.

On the positive side the theology of crisis offers the idea of the complete transcendence of God. God is not to be measured by human standards of goodness, truth, or beauty, but is complete in himself, the absolute sovereign. Man is utterly unable on the basis of his own will and capacities to come near to God. But God may look with compassion on man and extend a helping hand to him. God has indeed done this in the incarnation, the supreme Fact of history. In the incarnation revelation took place. Man's inability to rise above his own guilt and sin is now beside the point. God has offered him salvation. Man must accept it through faith in Christ in whom the Word of God was incarnate.

What, then, is new about the theology of crisis? Its content is as old as Calvin if not as old as Paul. What is new is the

attempt to adjust this doctrine to the thought of the modern world. Its exponents have tried to do it by showing that this theology lays primary emphasis on the difference between religion and all other forms of human experience. Religion, they claim, is not science nor philosophy nor ethics, and so is not subject ultimately to the usual tests of verifiability, consistency, or use. Religion asks not an abstract question but the burning practical question as to what life is all about, and what man can do with it. Its interest is not in how man can rightly conceive reality but how he can rightly exist in relation to the reality that has been revealed. This question takes precedence over and dominates the philosophical inquiry. And it is itself the final ethical issue, since the problem how man can become real in this life is one with the problem as to how he can best live with his fellows.

The question of origins is not the same as that of validity, and an inquiry into the beginnings of this movement will not settle the issue of its truth, but it may help to prevent some misunderstandings. In the first place, it is not true, as is sometimes affirmed, that this theology arose out of an atmosphere of defeat. Its original leaders were not Germans but Swiss. Barth, its prophet and pioneer, is now a German university professor, but when he wrote his famous *Römerbrief* he was a pastor in Switzerland. Brunner, the systematizer and chief expositor of the movement, whose recent book *The Theology of Crisis* (Scribners) offers the best introduction in English to its thought, is professor at Zürich. Thurneysen, who has collaborated with Barth, is a pastor at Basel. But while it did not come directly out of the mind of a conquered people it is true that the war played a part in its formation. Before the war Barth had been interested in socialistic theories and in the possibilities they offered for man's economic and spiritual betterment. With the voting of the war credits by the German socialists, however, Barth lost faith in socialism and also in any attempts to find a solution for human problems in plans spun by the mind of man. For him man's ideals had shown their emptiness, his will to live up to his ideals its lack of power.

Post-war pessimism undoubtedly had something to do, also, with the way in which theological leaders in Germany later rallied around the banner which Barth upheld. But we in America do not always realize that even before the war European thinkers tended to question the reality of progress and to doubt the value of the ends of evolution much more than did thinkers on this side of the water. Our own economic prosperity and comfort is only one of the factors that has helped to keep such questions dormant. The European lives much closer than do we to the stream of history. His philosophy, *e.g.* the Hegelian, has taken more specific account of it than has ours. It has made historic movements more vivid and has left less opportunity for their ends to be taken as a matter of course. So while he has lived closer to the flux of events the European thinker has more readily achieved an intellectual position outside of that flux from which he could bring criticism to bear upon it. He has been especially skeptical of the tendency, since the Enlightenment, to think of human desires and standards as decisive in the determining of goodness and truth. One result of this construction of a philosophy of human values has been the view of the neo-Kantians and others that religion is a branch among others of human culture, its values are cultural values, its sanctions derivative from the standards of culture itself. It is this tendency which the crisis theologians find especially harmful. Religion thus described, they claim, is no religion. There is but one true religion and that is the Christian teaching of the incarnation. It is a transcendent, revealed teaching, based not upon man's aspirations after goodness but rather upon the fact of his need, because of his intrinsically guilty nature, and upon God's sovereign response to that need. Man cannot reason that God should respond to this need. We have simply the fact that God has done it. Our philosophy must conform to this fact instead of presuming to dictate terms to it.

The name "theology of crisis" expresses this complete break with the human, all-too-human ambitions of contemporary life. The name apparently grew on to the movement as a result of the emphasis which Bultmann, prominent Marburg theologian and member of this school of thought, has placed on the fact that

when the Christian believer sees the ideal which Christ presents he experiences a complete conversion in the Pauline sense and passes truly through a crisis. Brunner in his latest book also uses the term to suggest that a crisis or turning point has been reached in organized Christianity. The Christian religion must either reassert its original message, he claims, its distinction from all man-made movements and philosophies, or it must fall back to a place where it has no distinctive claim and becomes merely one among many tentative ways of life. The name "theology of dialectic" has sometimes been given to this school because of its assertion that religious thought moves in dialectical fashion from a combination of opposites to their resolution. Barth, for example, following Kierkegaard makes much of the essential contradiction between the world of God and eternity on the one hand and that of man and time on the other. The distinction between the two is so fundamental that it cannot be bridged except by a revelation from God himself. Brunner also brings out the contradiction between vegetative life and meaningful life. Man is in a contradictory state caused by the evil which is inherent in him and his own discomfort in the presence of that evil. The difficulty cannot be removed by growth or development, for the evil is radical. There must be not an e-volutio, or growth out of imperfection, but an in-gressio or entering in of the divine life.

The word "dialectic" suggesting the overcoming of contradictions thus seems to describe the religious life. It may be worth noting that Barth once told me in conversation that he preferred the name "theology of dialectic." Without doubt he wishes to get rid of the name "Barthian theology" which is often used. When I asked Brunner, however, he remarked that "theology of dialectic" savored too much of Hegelianism and that "theology of crisis" seemed more adequate.

The great asset of this theology, by whatever name it be called, lies in its attempt to restore to religion the things which distinctively belong to it. Religion today is undoubtedly in danger of losing its unique qualities, its appeal to authority for example, and of becoming a branch either of metaphysics or social ethics. But the question must be raised whether it is more important to

win back the distinguishing values of religion and to localize them in beliefs such as complete transcendence, absolute sovereignty of God, man's original sin, predestination, and the like which come out of a not altogether savory past, or to make what is distinctive in religion acceptable to the modern mind by showing its connection with the best that humanity has achieved both in abstract thought and practical ethics. The crisis theologians seem to be clinging to what they consider the essence of Christianity at the expense of cutting themselves off from all that the modern world has to contribute toward making religion both consistent and morally effective. We must be not spectators but participants in the drama of life, they constantly cry. The plea is a good one, but the way to meet it is not by claiming that all our thinking is but self-esteem and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags. The demands of truth and of morality are as binding as those of religion itself. The first assertion of religion, as Clutton-Brock so profoundly says, is not that God is, but that if he is, he must be according to our values. To ignore every claim except that of one historical religious tradition is to do just what bigoted and intolerant inquisitors in every religion have always done. I am not saying that these men are bigoted and intolerant. They are an earnest, devoted, scholarly group, for whom as persons I have the greatest respect. But their procedure is the sort which always plays into the hands of the dogmatist. Followed to its logical conclusion it leaves no place for criticism. That in their hands it is both scholarly and highly ethical is merely a result of the fact that they are scholarly and ethical men. In lesser men's hands it could easily become the servant of prejudice and obscurantism.

Brunner's claim, made in more than one of his books, that the principle of continuity, the belief in the essential oneness of God and man and in the inviolability of causal chain or logical sequence, is merely an assertion of man's own pride, seems to me to illustrate the lengths to which argument for a chosen cause may go. The assertion of what Brunner calls the principle of continuity so far from being a matter of pride is rather an indication of man's humility before the objective truth ideal. And why is not this humble attempt to learn what the vast cosmos

has to teach a more desirable quality than the conviction of sin in the presence of an arbitrary, angry God? We may have accepted too easily the idea that evolution and progress are the same thing. But to be jolted out of such complacency does not mean that we must seek refuge in a realm where man's ambition to achieve a reasonable view of the world and to perfect his own nature has no meaning.

Religion as an experience is different from other experiences, but religious knowledge and ethics cannot escape the tests to which all knowledge and ethics are subject. Our knowledge of even a transcendent God must be knowledge, otherwise we are left in intellectual chaos. And Christian ethics must itself be based on our understanding of the needs of society if it is to be truly ethical. The crisis theologians, by pointing out its dangers, may help us to avoid that attenuated extreme where Christianity loses its content. They may help us to see how a vigorous Christian message can be found without the Fundamentalist's blindness to the results of Biblical criticism. They may free us from a shallow optimism by showing the deeper levels of experience which lie below the plane of our daily life and also of our scientific inquiry. But they must not stigmatize as "man-made" such intellectual and ethical norms as honesty and charity. God himself must conform to these if he is to be a God for us. And if he does, then we know him as surely through the experience of these ideals in human life as we do through miracle and special revelation. In fact, we know him more surely because more simply. The theology of crisis with all the richness of its insights, for which we must indeed be grateful, has obscured instead of clarifying the great issues of life. Its problem is the great problem of all experience, but its solution uses forms of thought which for the modern world have lost their meaning.

## HERE AND THERE

AT the twenty-fifth reunion of the class of 1905, Bucknell University, a vote was taken as to which member of the class had achieved the greatest success. The honor went to the Reverend Lewis C. Hylbert, of the Baptist East China Mission at Shanghai, whose diligent labors in China for twenty years in evangelism and famine relief work have won the confidence of his colleagues of all denominations, that of the Chinese people, particularly substantial business men, and official recognition by the President of the Republic, who recently conferred upon him the honorary degree of CHAI HO HSUN CHANG—"Good Harvester."

\* \* \* \* \*

**F**RIENDS University at Wichita has opened the Wichita Child Research Laboratory under the direction of Dr. Edwina Abbott Cowan, a trained psychologist who has done notably successful work with children. The *Friends University Bulletin*, December, 1930, reports that during the first three months of its existence more than seventy cases were considered, involving a great variety of problems of mental testing, location of physical defects, personality, discipline, educational maladjustment, etc. The contacts of the laboratory afford a wholesome stimulus to the psychological interest of the student body and offer opportunity for advanced students to do important research work under competent direction. Friends now offers a major in psychology second to none of all colleges in Kansas.

\* \* \* \* \*

**B**AKER University at Baldwin, Kansas, is justly proud of the William Alfred Quayle Collection of Bibles—one of the most important exhibits of old and rare books to be found in any college library in the country, bequeathed to it by the late Bishop, a former president, as one of his most precious treasures. Miss Harriet Osborne, Librarian, has prepared an interesting booklet of twelve pages giving the significant facts regarding this collection which exemplifies the history of the Bible from the early parchments to the most perfect workmanship of our own day. Among the most interesting copies are a beautiful Latin Bible printed in London in 1656, containing the autograph of Robert Browning, and the family Bible of

Robert Louis Stevenson, containing the autograph of his grandfather. In drawing his will, Bishop Quayle indicated his purpose in this bequest thus—

"I give and bequeath to Baker University my collection of Bibles so that these books illustrative of chirography, printing and the poetry of religion may be always before the eyes of the students to the end that thereby they may be incited to scholarly love of books and deep enjoyment of them and abiding love of God."

\* \* \* \* \*

UNDER the general direction of Secretary Wilbur, there will be waged this year a vigorous campaign against illiteracy. The first objective will be among the Indians with adult illiteracy of the Blackfeet on their reservation at Browning, Montana. During March an intensive course of study will be undertaken with this tribe. The Indians will be assembled and for two weeks will be taught to write their names, how to read and how to take care of their financial accounts. In the meantime, as part of the constant crusade on behalf of reading and writing, the National Advisory Committee on Illiteracy is inaugurating a series of radio addresses to get across to the general public its objectives. Addresses will be made by Secretary Wilbur, Dr. John H. Finley, Lorado Taft and others.

\* \* \* \* \*

CO-EDS at Michigan State Normal, Ypsilanti, are advised not to smoke because if they do so it will not be easy for them to get jobs as teachers after graduation. This policy is started by President Charles McKenny in amplification of recent statements at the College regarding smoking and can be summed up as follows: "One item of advice and one rule. The College strongly advises its women students not to smoke at all for the reason that many school boards will not employ women teachers known to be smokers. The records of our placement office show that in only one instance has a superintendent engaged a woman candidate known to be a smoker. The rule is that women students shall not smoke upon the campus nor in public places in Ypsilanti." A recent rumor to the effect that women smokers will not be graduated from the institution is incorrect.

A ROUND Table Seminar on community relations of Jews, Catholics and Protestants similar to those conducted at several other universities was recently held at the University of Illinois.

This Seminar was of particular interest since it was fostered by the university churches and religious foundations in conjunction with the National Conference of Jews and Christians. Speakers of national prominence of all three faiths spoke and took part in the deliberations.

Colonel Patrick Henry Callahan, of Louisville, presented problems of religious prejudice as seen by a commission of five Catholics who made a three year survey of the problem in the United States. According to Colonel Callahan, there is very little religious prejudice in America. Prejudices do exist between races but are not due to basic religious differences.

The keynote of the Conference was sounded by Rev. Melville T. Kennedy, Pastor of the First Congregational Church at the University of Illinois, when he said: "We are not after toleration that seeks to level down religious convictions to a common plane, but after toleration that respects the beliefs and convictions of the other religions."

\* \* \* \* \*

Sponsored by all the religious groups represented on the campus and having the full endorsement of the faculty, a student Religious Emphasis Week was held at the University of Michigan, February 22 to March 1. Said President Ruthven, "The inauguration of Religious Emphasis Week is a project of significance in the life of the University . . . a week of concentration on spiritual values cannot fail to profit each of us."

Every church and religious group in any way connected with the University participated and held meetings at which nationally prominent men gave their time and thought to the solution of problems presented by students.

Among the leaders taking part in the activities of the week were Dr. Allyn K. Foster, who is working under the auspices of the Baptist Board of Education; Rev. Thomas L. Harris, Student Adviser and Chaplain at Harvard University; Dr. James King, President of Olivet College; Rev. J. Walter Malone, Presbyterian Student Pastor at University of Illinois; Dr. Louis Mann, Lecturer at the University of Chicago, Rev. Curtis W.

Reese, Chicago Pastor and Dean of Abraham Lincoln Center; Bishop William P. Remington of Eastern Oregon; Rev. William F. Robinson, S.J., of Loyola University; Fred B. Smith, Moderator of the National Council of Congregational Churches; Dr. N. J. Gould Wickey, Executive Secretary of the Lutheran Board of Education; Dr. James M. Yard, Director of Religious Activities at Northwestern University.

The Michigan Daily, student publication of the University, under date of February 25, 1931, carried an interesting editorial entitled "Where Religious Emphasis Belongs." In part it said:

The type and temper of the discussions offered are obviously designed to stimulate interest in the problems of religion and ethics in modern society, as well as to put the churches' best foot forward. Both of these factors will unquestionably increase the current interest in religious affairs with the aid of exceptional men in each of the denominations. This in itself is meritorious; the lack of interest which the administration of the University has in religious studies as witnessed by the paucity of courses in even related fields, to say nothing of the lack of so much as a chair of theology, is a disgrace to this institution. Hence, even the efforts of somewhat extra-mural organizations is to be commended.

Perhaps there will be a few world-beating achievements of this first Religious Emphasis Week other than a closer welding of the present denominational interests. But Michigan, as a University, is so lacking in its attention to this field of human thought as would warrant immediate concern and effort without waiting for the usual evolutionary or pylo-genetic changes to produce a more balanced condition in the curriculum and a more harmonious one in the minds of the students.

---

SYMPOSIUM ON  
RELIGIOUS WORK IN UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

ROBERT L. KELLY, *Editor*

Reprinted from CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, Vol. XIV, No. 3, December, 1930. Twenty-five copies, \$4.00; 50 copies, \$6.00; single copies, 25 cents. December CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, 35 cents.